ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE AND TO THE STANDING FINANCE COMMITTEE.

PRESIDENT : The election will take place after the House adjourns for the day.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

DEMAND XI—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION EXCLUDING FINANCIAL SECRETARIAT, ACCOUNT OFFICE, LEGISLATIVE BODIES AND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSIONER.

Motion No. 365.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI : *Sir, last evening, I was at the question of the attitude of Government towards journalism, and I referred to the fact that some papers have been suppressed. It is a fact that the number of newspapers in Travancore has gone down considerably during the last few years.

Sir, the papers that are now working are under a cloud of extreme fear for the Government. They are being threatened that Government's displeasure will be on them not only if they publish anything that is against or not in favour of the Government, but also if they do not publish articles and news in support of the Government. That is the situation. Papers that publish anything about the State Congress are viewed with disfavour, and are warned. Several editors have told me that they have got instructions from the authorities that even the mention of the name State Congress in their papers is objectionable. Now, Sir, I ask, is this not suppression of the civil rights of the citizens to an extent unheard of in Travancore or in any civilized country. In passing, I may refer to the large number of prohibitory orders issued by the District Magistrates in recent months. I may mention, Sir, that, since the State Congress was organised, not even a single meeting was held in Trivandrum. The Trivandrum District Magistrate issued a prohibitory order, and served it on me also. It was to the effect that no meeting should be convened or held. He stated that there were among the public of Travancore parties opposed to responsible government and that, therefore, if any meeting was held, such parties would come and cause disturbance which would naturally result in a breach of the peace. Sir, I moved the District Magistrate by means of a petition offering to let him evidence that there was absolutely no justification for his position that there was any likelihood of a breach o the peace. But, he merely dismissed the petition on the ground that it was only an executive order and that therefore he was not bound nor prepared, to take evidence. He merely confirmed his prohibitory order, although he had absolutely nothing to support his position except his own statement that he got some information from somewhere—from the air evidently—that breach of the peace was likely. Th Trivandrum District was under that ban for two months. Then can similar order from the Quilon District Magistrate, and then from the

* Speech not corrected by the member.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. A. Thanu Pillai.]

Kottayam District Magistrate also. Therefore, Sir, the whole country, except the hilly tract comprising the Devicolam Division, was under such ban.

Sir, the State Congress did not violate these orders; as peaceful citizens they submitted to them. When these orders expired, some how or other Government did not find it expedient to extend the period of these orders. Meetings were attempted to be held. There again, suppression of civil liberties came in. The police were responsible for bringing in rowdies to cause disturbances at meetings. In one meeting at Neyyattinkarai, the District Magistrate prohibited the meeting. ....

PRESIDENT: The Honourable member has exceeded his time; but I give him four minutes more.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI: At one of the meetings which we held at Neyyattinkarai for the mere reason that some questions were put to the speakers by a few among the audience, the District Magistrate issued an order that the meeting was an unlawful assembly and that therefore it should be dispersed. That meeting also was dispersed in obedience to the order of the District Magistrate. I ask, Sir, if the putting of questions to the speaker can be a justifying ground to declare a meeting an unlawfnl assembly, can any meeting be held at any time anywhere? Is it not, I ask, the duty of the police and the District Magistrate to enable and help persons to hold public meetings peacefully? Is it not the right of every citizen to take part in public meetings? Sir, this is the way the civil liberties of the peaceful citizens of Travancore are being dealt with by the Magistrates and the Police.

Then, Sir, again came a further period of prohibitory orders. Now also, the whole State is under a similar ban; again we have prohibitory orders in the Trivandrum, Quilon and Kottayam Divisions. I do not want to dilate upon details as I have no time to do it. I merely refer to these orders to show that our civil liberties are being curtailed.

I must also refer to one other fact. Certain other political organisations have now come into being, at any rate with the moral support of the Government. Now the position is this. These new organisations are allowed to hold their meetings and to do propaganda in places where the State Congress is being suppressed although some of these organisations openly state that their ultimate objective is the same as that of the State Congress. One is really at a loss to understand how the Government can allow these new organisations to carry on their propaganda while they curb the activities of the State Congress. Certainly the Government must have their own reasons. It is clear that the persons responsible for bringing into existence some of these new organisations are those who have been supporting the Government in time and out of time, persons who want to gain their own ends by favour at the hands of Government. But these organisations not only carry on their propaganda but also villify the State Congress, and that is being allowed. Recently, there was a meeting of the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

National Congress at Quilon. The Government did not object to that meeting being held although the purpose of that meeting also was for the grant of responsible government. Sir, if, among the people of Travancore there are some parties who are opposed to responsible government, I wonder how the meeting of the National Congress at Quilon would have been allowed, while the State Congress is being suppressed.

Sir, I have no time to go into the details. I certainly lay the blame of partisanship at the doors of Government. They are partial to one section of the public while opposed to another. That, certainly, cannot be tolerated.

Now, all this arises from the fundamental position that the Government are opposed to the exercise of legitimate civil liberties by the people. It is only those that support the Government in season and out of season that will be allowed their rights of citizenship. Whenever a person expresses his independent view and that view is not acceptable to Government he is put down. Sir, if this is allowed to go on, I must certainly inform the Government that self-respecting citizens, who have their own programme to carry on, cannot be expected to obey these prohibitory orders for all time. Naturally, such self-respecting individuals will find it necessary to violate those orders if occasion arises.

PRESIDENT : Such threats are unnecessary in the course of this discussion.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI I may make it plain that it is not a thread at all. The position is this. A certain section of the people, a certain organisation, is being put down by the Government, while certain other organisations with ostensibly the same aim are being supported by the Government. What did the District Magistrate do when he issued the prohibitory order and when I put in a petition offering to let in evidence to prove that there was no basis for his position? He merely would not take in evidence on the ground that it was only an executive order and as such he was not bound to take in evidence, and on the ground that he had some information from somewhere that his position was right. Government declared certain bodies as disloyal and and their activities subversive; and, if they are asked for the reason they merely say that those bodies criticise the Government and condemn Governmental activities. In these circumstances, what is it that any self-respecting citizen can be expected to do? Most reluctantly, most unwillingly, we will be put to the necessity of violating these prohibitory orders. Sir, this is not a threat. My submission to the House is that the House must carefully consider the position in which certain individuals have now been placed. In the present circumstances, what can any self-respecting citizen be expected to do? As I said, in regard to the State Congress, I asked the Government why and how they were disloyal: but the Government were not prepared to give any convincing reason. I asked the District Magistrate why he promulgated the prohibitory order, and offered to let in evidence; but he would say that it

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. A. Thanu Pillai.]

was an executive order and that it was absolutely within his power to deal with the situation in the manner he did and that he was not bound to take any evidence. Sir, the natural corollary of this attitude of Government and their officers towards law-abiding citizens will be that such citizens will be put to the painful necessity of violating these prohibitory orders; and I may say that, when such time arrives, the responsibility for the situation will be solely on the Government and their officers, and not on the peace-loving citizens who are driven to that course.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI (*Thovala* cum *Agastisvaram*): Sir, I wish to offer a few remarks in connection with the motion. At the very outset I may assure the House, that I will be second to none in upholding the civil liberties of the citizens of the State. I am perfectly aware of the obligations and duties of citizens who have the right to demand civil liberties Sir, I care more for such obligations and duties of citizenship rather than for the rights of citizenship. I was listening with attention to the honourable member Mr. Thanu Pillai. Sir, in the course of his speech he thought it fit to refer to certain other political organisations that have been recently brought into existence in this State, and he made specific reference to the Travancore National Congress and to its meeting at Quilon. I certainly expected that my friend Mr. Thanu Pillai would have understood the implications of civil liberties and the obligations of citizenship. Certainly, when he expects others to grant him his civil liberties, I expect him to grant the same civil liberties to others. There cannot be any civil liberty which interferes with other's rights. Does this position require an authority? What does Tom Paine say on the subject of liberty? He says "liberty is a right to do whatever is not contrary to the rights of others." I ask Mr. Thanu Pillai whether, in his observations about the Travancore National Congress he was not demanding something for himself which was quite contrary to the rights of others, rights similar to those which he demanded for himself. I ask him in all earnestness whether he was right in tabooing another political organisation, which unfortunately is not able to agree with him in the method of operation, although its ideal is the same as that of the organisation to which Mr. Thanu Pillai belongs. I ask him whether there is any justification for tabooing another political organisation in the way he did. He went to the extent of saying that certain persons who sought to gain their own ends from the Government have joined together and brought into existence that new political organisation. I can easily turn the table on him. Now look at the genesis of the State Congress party. What are the antecedents of the promoters of that party? It is better left unsaid.

Am I not equally entitled to ask whether it is not out of disgruntled experience in life that certain members of the State Congress Party attack Government in season and out of season. I ask him, is this after all civil liberty. I shall not dilate on this matter. I shall proceed further.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. Thanu Pillai opened his remarks by saying that till very recently the situation in the State has been all right and that there has been no restraint on any person or newspaper in respect of their freedom of opinion, and that there has been no check on the liberty of opinion either in the press or on public platforms. I would like to know whether he has conveniently forgotten the recent instances, namely the case of Mr. C. Kesavan and the case of the paper 'Rasikan'. He may have forgotten the case of the paper Rasikan which was treated in the manner it deserved by the Government. But certainly he could not have forgotten the case of Mr. C. Kesavan, in respect of whose reception after he was released from the jail, the action of the then Deputy President was the subject of a censure motion in the House.

MR. E. JOHN PHILIPOSE: On a point of order Sir. The censure motion in this House was about the Deputy President representing 51 lakhs of people and not about political convictions.

PRESIDENT: It is not a point of order.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI: I hope the member will have the patience to understand me. In that censure motion Mr. Thanu Pillai also participated and he adopted a very strong attitude in the matter. I think that one single instance alone would have been sufficient for me to refresh his memory that slightly before this time, at any rate before this present administration, there have on proper occasions been suppressions of the socalled liberties of citizenship. Sir, is it after all proper in the course of this debate to introduce certain things alone and forget similar things which are conveniently left alone. I ask Mr. Thanu Pillai "Is it fair? And is it not insinuation? Or is it, I ask, a matter of pure conviction? I ask, does it this wilful suppression proceed out of the sea green which is said to be incorruptible? Why should there he such a false position taken up by him in respect of this debate?

Now, I come to journalism, Sir. I may remind the House that on a certain former occasion a very old and experienced getleman in the State Council remarked in his own manner that journalism in the State at any rate has not developed in any desirable direction. I shall give you certain instances of the kind of journalism in the State and let the House draw its own inferences. Sometime back I remember there was a publication in the Malayali. With the little knowledge of Malayam that I possess I tried to understand the implication of that article. There was a quotation from Carlisle's French Revolution in that article and there was a significant reference to the King going astray and consequently the forces that developed and to the action of the people. In other words, there is absolute insinuation there in that article. Nothing more and nothing less. I have got a copy of the paper. I shall not take up the time of the House by reading the whole article in question.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. M. Sivathanu Pillai.]

I shall only refer the House to the Malayali dated the 18th December 1937 and the title of the article in attractive manner. The title runs as follows, which is printed in a captivating manner:—

ഫ്റഞ്ചുവിപ്ലവത്തിന്റെ കാരണങ്ങളം.

ഉരുള്ളുവിട്ടുനം മന്ദമതിയുമായ ഒരു രാജാവു്, രാജ്യഭരണകാര്യത്തിൽ കൈകടത്തുന്ന ദുർവ്യയക്കാരിയായ ഒരു രാജ്ഞി, ഇന്ദ്രജാലത്താലെന്നപോലെ കടത്തിനു മേൽ കടം വാങ്ങി ചെലവു നിർവഹിക്കുന്ന ഒരു മന്ത്രി.

(എച്ചു്. ജി. വെയിൽസിന്റെ ഔട്ട്ലൈൻ ആഫ് ഹിസ്റ്ററിയിൽനിന്നു്.)

MR. E. JOHN PHILIPOSE: On a point of order, Sir. I object to the statement being made with insinuation in respect of individuals that are far beyond the purview of the Legislature.

PRESIDENT: I take it that the object of the honourable member who is speaking is to point out the license allowed to the newspapers and the extent to which they can go.

MR. E. JOHN PHILIPOSE: He is certainly not entitled to.....

PRESIDENT: Order, order. It is the decision of the President.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI: I am only referring to this paper. I may be permitted to point out to the members that in a very catching manner the title of the article is given and I ask whether there is any other object behind that article than to set up an unrest in this country. Sir, I am second to none in the matter of taking part in the so-called peaceful revolution provided I have got the courage of my conviction. What is the insinuation, what is the effect of that article which I have referred to? What is the occasion for the paper to refer to the French Revolution? Is there any occasion for it in the State except that it might exist in the imagination of the editor of the paper? Now, I pass on to another paper. I do not propose to read the article in question or deal with it—I am averse to doing it and I am afraid it may lead to some other impression which is not desired by me. I refer to the article in Prabodhini where there is a significant reference to the Paramount Power taking action in Native States, as an instance of which there was a quotation referring to Mansa State. What is the implication? What is the depth of this insinuation? No wonder, Sir, such newspapers indulge in such insinuations because, as I had occasion to point out,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

there is a free indulgence in insinuations which journals enjoy in Travancore without restraint. Is it the same treatment that you expect in other places? Certainly not; because it is not the exercise of one's own rights. It is contrary to the rights of others. That is why I said it is not a right to freedom of opinion. It is not a right which accrues from the correct conception of citizenship. I say it is only license; and in this instance it is unbridled license.

Then, Sir, I come to certain speeches. I had occasion to get a report of the speech delivered very recently outside this House by one of the compatriots of Mr. Thanu Pillai in the State Congress party. The speaker was vociferously maintaining that he was not holding out a threat. In the speech that I referred to, after referring to so many instances, whether true or not, the speaker declares—

> "I visualise, if the Government do not retrace their steps, we will let loose non-voilent civil war."

I ask, Sir, what does this mean? What is the spirit behind it except egoism if not rank arrogance? Is it after all the spirit which we all associate with the Leader of a Party firm in the courage of this conviction? As I have already understood the experience of leaders in British India, certainly he cannot be the leader of a party worth the name. If that be the attitude taken up by him, where are we drifting? There is absolutely no place for any one of us to have common cause with him.

PRESIDENT: The honourable member must give more particulars.

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI: I refer to the speech of Mr. G. Ramachandran as is reported to have been delivered at a meeting, held recently one or two days before, at the Railway Station Maidan.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI: I wish that the member reads the whole portion of the speech containing that statement.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI: That is left to me.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI: On a point of order, Sir. Is it fair to allow a member to select just a few words from a speech, whatever that be, and proceed on that basis?

PRESIDENT: It is no doubt a point of fairness. If a speech when read as a whole will give a completely different version to a selected passage, it is unfair to read the selected passage. But if after that has been pointedly drawn to the attention of the honourable member and he does not correct himself, it is open to other honourable members to correct it.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI: This is the point of order. I want him to read that portion of the speech in which the statement occurs. It is too much to expect that the other honourable members will be ready with the entire speech. The member must be prepared to give the full facts to the House.

PRESIDENT: I understand that the speech has been published in the newspaper and I take it that the honourable member has taken it from that newspaper.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI: I think my friend Mr. Thanu Pillai will know it better. Let alone the speeches outside the House. I am coming to the speeches delivered on the floor of this House. I have been listening to the speeches in detail delivered by the members of the State Congress Party. I have got great regard and respect for the members who sit on the left side of the House, namely, the State Congress Party. I must confess and in saying that, I am taking the House into my confidence, that the members belonging to certain section of the Party have got to their credit beautiful speeches and they are delivered with a certain amount of moderation, reason and toleration. I refer to the speeches delivered by the Christian friends of the State Congress Party. One or two of these members have been uniformly courteous, reasonable and tolerant in their speech.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI: Is it due to their religion?

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI: I will come to it. Although Mr. Thanu Pillai was not kind enough to answer my questions, I have got the charity to answer him. I say it may be more out of the spirit of their religion. On the other hand what do I find in regard to the speeches from members of my own 'co-religionists' in that Party. They are freely indulging in intimidatory language sometimes bordering on profane insinuation.

In this connection, I wish to point out, to the Government as a matter for serious consideration that there is discontent in this country among a respectable section of the people and it is high time that the Government realise it. As instance of it I will point out the case of the Ezhava community which has all along been suppressed. Now that the Temple Entry Proclamation has been issued, they feel that they are equal with others in all respects and it is no wonder that they expect their legitimate demands to be granted by Government. If Government are not prepared to satisfy the legitimate demands of such communities in respect of representation in public services it is no wonder that there is discontent among such communities in the country.

One word to the Government. It is true that there has been difference of opinion in respect of prohibitory orders issued by the District Magistrates. I for one would certainly not countenance the issue of such orders except on extraordinary occasions, is going too far. The law of the land is sufficient enough and the arm of the law long enough to cover any case. When such is the case, I ask why should there be a frequent recourse to the issue of prohibitory orders by the District Magistrates. I must also concede, Sir, that such orders are not fully justified. If Government are convicted that there is intimidatory speech and in violation of the law there is the law of the land comprehensive enough to cover that case and comprehensive though to meet out adequate punishment.

MR. P. K. KUNJU (*Quilon cum Kottarakara*) : മലയാളിയിൽ പ്ര സിദ്ധപ്പെടുത്തിയിരുന്നതായി മെംബർ ഉദ്ധരിച്ച ലേഖനം പ്രസിദ്ധപ്പെ ടുത്തിയതിനശേഷമല്ലെ മലയാളി പത്രാധിപക്ക് അടികൊണ്ടതു?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR: M. SIVATANU PILLAI : അടികൊണ്ടതു എന്നാണെന്ന് എന്നിക്കറിഞ്ഞുകൂടാ. "വിപ്ലവത്തിന്റെ കാരണം" എന്ന് പ്രസ്ദ്ധപ്പെടുത്തിയിരുന്ന ലേഖനം ഞാൻ വായിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്.

MR, P. K. KUNJU : മലയാളിപത്രാധിപക്ക് അടികൊണ്ടതു് അറിഞ്ഞിട്ടില്ലേ?

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI : അങ്ങിനെ ഞാൻ കേട്ടിട്ടുണ്ട്.

MR. K. NARAYANAPERUMAL NADAR : Sir, I support the motion. The Leader of the State Congress Party has stated that civil liberties are denied to the people of the State. But I will go a step further and say that the people of the State are not allowed to speak of even civil liberties in public places. I will give an example to corroborate my statement. On the 6th March 1938 corresponding to 23rd Masi 1113 there was a public meeting in the municipal maidan in front of the municipal building at Nagercoil. Notices were issued to the public and there it was stated that the President was Mr. Pacode A. Narayana Pillai, B. A., B. L., the Leader of the Nagercoil Bar. But unfortunately he was not present at the meeting. So, one Mr. Muthukaruppa Pillai was voted to the Chair at that meeting. The meeting began at 4 p. m. The subject of discussion was "Civil Liberties." At 5·30 ar 5·45 p. m. stones were thrown at the crowd. I was told by many respectable citizens of Nagercoil who came to meet me that goondaism was committed by the police assembled there. I may inform the House that I am the permanent President of the Civil Liberties Union at Nagercoil. On 13th May 1938, I addressed a meeting in Eathamoli, where, the subject was responsible Government. Ever since I addressed that meeting, for a period of three months or so I am shadowed by a C. I D. constable of the Edalakudi station and his name is Velu Pillai. Now my question is, can a member of this Assembly, an elected member of this Assembly, who is representing two taluks, Tovala and Agastisvaram, which are very important ones be shadowed. Has he no right to address a public meeting on responsible Government? It is my duty to see that section of the public are responsible to the Government? The people there are not sufficiently educated. They are very poor in point of wealth as well as education. Most of them are illiterate. Is it not necessary that I should address a meeting on Responsible Government to educate the electorate there? If it were peopled by numerous Syrian Christians who are literate I can understand my remaining silent. It is not necessary for me to address a constituency composed of Nairs because they are very politically conscientious and sufficiently educated. It is my duty to educate the Nadar community on the subject of Responsible Government. I think I am entitled to address them on the subject of civil liberties. It is my supreme duty to elevate their position, in view of their illiteracy. It was on the 13th May I addressed a meeting in Tamil. To repeat the point, I have for the last four months been shadowed by a C. I. D. constable. Sir, I am not afraid of the Dewan or the Police Commissioner or the Chief Secretary to Government or

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. K. Narayanaperumal Nadar.]

the Dewan Peishkar of Trivandrum. But I am mortally afraid of a C. I. D. constable who shadows me every day from morning till evening. I am afraid of an ordinary C. I. D. constable because he will get drunk and assault me. That matter is known not only to the whole public of Eathamoli but also that part of the State. They ask me, "Well, Mr. Nadar, how is it that you are shadowed by a C. I. D. constable. Is there anything wrong in the Police Department or is something wrong with Government." They think that it was because I addressed a meeting on Responsible Government under the aegis of His Highness the Maharaja to the people of Eathamoli, such a fate has happened to me. The people of my constituency knows full well that I am being shadowed by a C. I. D. constable which leads them indirectly to think that they want Responsible Government.

One day I went to Nedumangad to see the Trivandrum Peishkar Mr. Paramesvara Panikkar. He was staying in the satram. I consider him to be one among the few honest officers of the State. He asked me whether I addressed a political meeting. I answered him in the affirmative. He questioned me again whether I addressed a meeting on Responsible Government. I said Yes. Then he asked me whether notices were issued to the people of Eathamoli about the holding of a meeting on Responsible Government. I said No. He wanted the reason for that. I answered him that if notices were issued, there will be goondaism by the police. It was for this reason notices were not issued to the people about the meeting. So then, Sir, for the last four months I am not able to address my constituency even on primary subjects. It is my duty and right to educate the people and to inform them of what is going on in Trivandrum, in the Sri Mulam Assembly and in the Sri Chitra State Council. The people of my constituency, namely, Tovala and Agastisvaram, particularly Nadars, who are not sufficiently educated. They do not read newspapers either. They can read only Tamil newspapers. But unfortunately there is not even a single Tamil newspaper in our State. It is therefore my supreme duty to educate them and to inform them, from time to time, of the happenings in the Legislature. For the last 4 months I was not allowed to address any meeting. I am being shadowed by the C. I. D. For that matter, I am prepared to be shadowed by a Police Inspector or the A. S. P. or the D. S. P. or even the Police Commissioner. They are all very responsible officers. However, I do not like to be shadowed an ordinary police constable. So that then viewing the whole thing it seems to me that there is something wrong with the Police Department; there is something wrong with the Government. Are the Government entitled to curtail the civil liberties of the people? In Cochin and other places there is nothing of the kind. With these words I support the motion.

MR. E. P. VARGHESE: Sir, I am sorry I do not find my way to agree with the honourable mover of the motion. I do not see that civil liberties are curtailed in a manner requiring so much of protest on the floor of this House. Let me make it clear that I should have been

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

the first to protest if I were convinced that civil liberties were actually curtailed in our State. I am afraid, on the other hand we have too much of liberty. It is tantamount to license. I shall first deal with the newspapers. The honourable mover referred to the cancellation of the licence of one paper which took place about two months ago. Well, Sir, it is not the first time that licences of newspapers have been cancelled in Travancore. During 1108, 1109 and 1110 perhaps the licenses of four or five papers were cancelled. The honourable mover knew it. He was a member of this Assembly then. He never raised a protest at that time. He never talked a single syllable on that point, at that time. He did not raise any alarm about the curtailment of civil liberties. Now, he makes much of the cancellation of the licence of one single newspaper. He talks much about the curtailment of civil liberties. All this, for what purpose? The licence of that particular paper was cancelled because it published a letter which stated that if there is to be a stable Government in Travancore the power should pass from the Palace to the people. What does it mean? Does it not mean the establishment of a republic? Does it not at least mean that the power of the Palace, the power of His Highness the Maharaja should be reduced to mere shadow. Sir, if such things cannot be dealt with by Government, I wonder what is the purpose of a Newspaper Regulation. If things can go to that extent without being taken to task, I submit, that it is a violation of the ordinary liberties of the people. Freedom of the Press does not mean license.

Turn at random to any of the articles published in the Newspapers such as 'the Prabodhini', 'the Navasakti', 'the Malayali' and 'the Malayala Manorama' of the last 4 or 5 months.

MR. E. JOHN PHILIPOSE: What about the articles published in 'the Malayala Rajyam"?

MR. E. P. VARGHESE: Sir, there are articles in the papers I mentioned which, under ordinary circumstances, require action being taken up immediately. If it were in any other Indian State, the papers which contained such articles would have been seriously dealt with. There are such open and scatching criticism of Government. There are insinuations against high personages. There are defamatory statements. It is said that these things should be tolerated. It is known that these articles have been really tolerated, and yet it is said that there is no civil liberty in this State. It is said that there is no freedom of the Press. Now I seriously ask, what is the kind of freedom of the press that those who complain would like to have. If this is not freedom of opinion, if this is not freedom for the expression of opinion, what is it that they want to express. I think it is better they do not express it. I shudder to think what those unexpressed opinions will be!

Now I come to the question relating to freedom of speech. We are having every day public meetings and speeches in Trivandrum and in other parts of Travancore. Public meetings are not generally prohibitted in this State. It is only the activities of a section of the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. E. P. Varghese.]

people, a particular organisation, that are prohibited. It is not considered that the ordinary right of holding a public meeting ay a citzen should be prevented. Nothing of the kind is happening in Travancore. We have had many speeches delivered even in Trivandrum during the last few days. We have heard s rong words uttered against Government, against persons in high authority. Those speeches are tending to create a sad state of affairs. It is said that there will be a civil war It is said that there will be bloodless revolution. We have been given notice that within a few weeks, a civil disobedience movement will be started. Well, if these things can be talked publicly, can it be said that freedom of speech has been curtailed. No action has been taken hitherto on those utterances. If meetings were prohibited how could such speeches have been delivered by persons who are already warned that they should not address public meetings under the auspieces of certain organisations. These persons have been gagged to a certain extent as a result of the events that happened during the past few months. But they have circumvented the order. No action has been taken against them. Even then they complain that civil liberties have been curtailed.

All that I have to say in this connection is that it is all propaganda. In Shertallai I understand a speech has been delivered in which the Catholic Church and His Holiness the Pope have been held up to ridicule by a member of the State Congress party. If such things are allowed, will there be peace in this land. There are people of different castes and creeds. Susceptibilities of the different communities are to be respected. None should wound the feelings of another. Even if such things happen, the Government do not take notice of them. Still the members of the State Congress party complain that there is no freedom of speech, a suppression of civil liberty. What is it that they want? Do they want freedom to speak whatever in any manner they like? We are not going in for revolutions. We are not going in for civil wars. We want Responsible Government. But there is a way of agitating for that. The ignorance of the people should not be exploited. The poor people should be given an opportunity to understand the real implications of the question relating to Responsible Government.

I do not want to dilate on this question. My time is limited. I wish to impress on the attention of members that what is called freedom of speech and the freedom of the Press should not descend to a license which will infringe the ordinary rights of a citizen. Others have also a sense of self respect. Their feelings should not be wounded. They should not in any way be made the subject of ridicule. The present day speeches are tending to create a spirit of irreverence for law and authority in the land. If law and authority are held up to ridicule in this manner, if there is no respect for law and order, I ask where is the sanction for a good Government. Even in a system of Government where the Congress reigns supreme there is the suppression of

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

the so-called civil liberties. There was the prosecution of the Batliwala by the Congress Government of Madras. Prosecution is going on in connection with anti-Hindi campaign. All these things are happening in a Congress Government. A Government which truly wants to govern, will have at times to apply their strong hand whenever they find the people going beyond limits. It is not in a particular system of Government that we have such difficulties. In any system of Government that wants to govern there will arise occasion to suppress political activities which strictly undermine Government. By these prohibitions it should not be understood that civil liberties are being curtailed.

MR. T. M. VARGHESE (*Pathanamtitta*): Sir, I support the motion which has been moved by Mr. Thanu Pillai, under whose leadership it is my privilege to be a member of the State Congress Party. My main object in supporting this motion is to attempt to convince the honourable members of this House that, apart from considerations of party politics, there is need for members of this House to stand up as one man in defence of the fundamental rights of citizenship, which, according to me are now at stake. Rowdyism in some form or other, in spite of the police though not by reason of their efforts, is likely to persist in Travancore as else where. The Government of Travancore, like other Governments, is liable to err. It is certainly not right on the part of an impartial critic to hasten to the conclusion that, because Government committed a stray mistake, even with the result that some of the fundamental rights of citizenship have thereby been directly or indirectly prejudiced, there is a systematic plan or deliberate motive behind the action of the Government. All this I can concede. But I ask and very earnestly and seriously ask the members of this House whether we can view the recent developments as acts which need not arrest the attention of this House or as disconnected incidents without a plan behind them. It may be that the commissioner of Police cannot afford to believe some of the statements of fact placed for the consideration of this House by a few of the honourable members. But when we find that the person and property of students are not safe within the premises of their College, when respectable citizens, whether they be labourers at Alleppey or members of the State Congress at Nedunganda, are allowed to be molested and assaulted with impunity and when citizens engaged in the discharge of their lawful duties are being attacked by rowdies at the instance of the police and with their help and connivance; when this unholy and unnatural alliance is brought about between the police who are custodians of the peace and the rowdies who are breakers of law with the result that peaceful citizens are rendered helpless in defending and maintaining their rights, I ask, does it not behove this House to consider and decide upon a course of conduct which will serve adequately to safeguard the fundamental rights of citizenship without which life is not worth living.

In speaking of this motion, I would invite the attention of the House to a matter which has been briefly touched upon by the mover

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. T. M. Varghese.]

of the motion. State Congress meetings have been banned, presumably for the reason that members of the State Congress are deemed disloyal and their activities subversive. We have been repeatedly asking on the floor of this House for information as to how and why the activities of the State Congress are considered subversive and the members thereof disloyal. It is certainly the duty of the Government, unless they can show that in public interest the information cannot be imparted, to enlighten the House as to the reasons that induced them to have such a large number of its members who are all elected representatives of the people branded in a body with the stigma of disloyalty and subversiveness. The attitude of Government in the matter is certainly indefensible. They have in fact no reason or explanation to offer and therefore none is forthcoming. While keeping the State Congress under check by means of these persistent and systematic banning orders for the last four months and more other organisations with seemingly similar objects are allowed or made to spring up and their meetings are openly and publicly conducted with the help and guidance of the Police. We have no need to quarrel over the number of organisations that are brought into existence, nor need we concern ourselves with the source from which they draw their inspiration or can trace their origin. Let the fittest survive. What I venture to ask is why not allow the State Congress to place their cards on the table so that the people may easily realise what that organisation stands for, what stuff its promoters are made of and how far the interests of the people will be safe in their hands. Let our motives and methods be subjected to the severest test and closest scrutiny by the people of our country and let them decide for themselves whether the State Congress is not an organisation capable of voicing forth their sentiments and safeguarding their interests. Why not then allow the State Congress a chance I ask. I need hardly submit that no Government can afford to give occasion for a reasonable impression of partiality or unfairness in respect of its dealings. The attitude of the Government towards the State Congress is highly unfair to say the least of it.

Before concluding I may submit one circumstance for the consideration of this House. We may have the allegiance to our party to reckon with and party politics may not always admit of fair criticism. We may be temporarily deprived of even our common sense and may thereby be rendered unfit to see things in their proper perspective. The situation we now are called upon to face is sufficiently complicated. Let us not by our conscious efforts on unconscious indifference create further complications, whatever be the advantages that may accrue to us from such complications. Let not succeeding generations, reading the history of our activities of this period, get occasion to accuse us of having betrayed the vital interests of our country out of considerations of self interest or through cowardice.

I may also refer to another matter of some importance. The State Congress party as you know is composed of members of different communites. Our attempt is to minimise and ultimately do away with

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

communal differences by effectively removing the need for such differances and thus to hasten a national outlook in the country. There are Nayars, Ezhavas and Nadars, there are Muslims and Christians. We as a party have ultimately to rely upon our intrinsic merits. We know that. As a member of this party I feel quite confident that there is enough strength in us, strength borne of the honesty and sincerity of our motives and our determination of purpose, so as to enable us succesfully to withstand all malicious attacks directed against us. Any attempt designed to bring to bear upon us forces of disruption is bound to fail. Christians need not be cajoled by being complimented as moderate, nor Hindus condemned as extremists.

PRESIDENT : The question before the House is whether Civil liberties are curtailed by Government.

MR. T. M. VARUHESE : I may pray the indulgence of the Chair for making this incidental reference in order to refute the suggestions contained in the speech made by honourable member Mr. Sivatanu Pillay. He expressed in unequivocal terms and without any interruption that the members of our party can be classified by communities as moderates and extemists.

PRESIDENT: I do not know why Mr. Varughese should refer to what Mr. Sivatanu Pillay said. The debate will go on with reference to the civil liberties being curtailed by Government and without referance to the future ot the programme of the party to which the honourable member belongs.

MR. T. M. VARUGHESE : I shall not deal with that point. I shall taking advantage of the sugggstion.....

PRESIDENT : It is not a suggestion. It is a ruling.

MR. T. M. VARGHESE: Bowing to the ruling of the Chair, I shall refer to the cut motion before the House. Speaking about civil rights which we are called upon to protect, I submit that it is our paramount duty to exert ourselves to the utmost in that direction. As for the State Congress I may assure the House that it will go on with its programme to which it stands wedded. It will go on in spite of all opposition and danger it may be called upon to combat, and in spite of all undeserved contempt and unthinking prejudice.

Before closing, I would add only one more word by way of caution for the consideration of this House. Truth cannot be concealed for a long time. The attempt to cloud truth and honesty by dishonesty and unscrupulousness must certainly come to light ere long. It is only a question of time. If the State Congress is what it claims to be and its activities are characterised by the honesty, sincerity and determination that it lays claim to there will be all the people of our country in the Congress and the Congress in the people, taking care of and protecting each other. In conclusion I may say that the authority and right of any Government to curtail the freedom of some sections of the people are always co-extensive with the need for protecting the freedom and the common good of the generality of the people. The reverse appears

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. T. M. Varghese.]

to be the principle adopted by the Government in their attitude towards the State Congress and its activities.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Changanacherry* cum *Peermade*) : I oppose the motion. It is with a sense of disgust that I am facing the discussion. I thought at least for this Session we have ot rid of this nuisance and the remaining days would be left for discussing other matters, which I consider more important in public interest. On Monday the 20th Mithunom, this melodrama began with an incessant series of adjournment motions and repeated walkouts and the whole thing met with a logical Fifth Act on Friday evening. I hoped that at least in the interest of dramatic art the curtain would be dropped. Not that I am unaware of proclamations of a nonviolent civil war and a bloodless revolution but I hoped that these political antics will be confined to the Thampanur arena and the Legislative Assembly would be allowed to mind their own business.

If the motion has been one for the general protection of civic rights or for the enlargement of civic rights, I would have gladly and wholeheartedly supported it. But it is nothing of that kind. It is nothing but a summary of the various adjournment motions severally moved by the State Congress. It is nothing but a fresh opportunity to give a consolidated list of the wellknown complaints of the party and a new disguise for repeating all the personal allegations often made in this House. I am constrained to repudiate those allegations and oppose the motion. Much has been said about the protection of the rights of citizens. I am behind no one in protecting the rights of the citizens of this country but I refuse to admit that Government have done anything extraordinary or out of the way. Much has been said about the curtailment of the freedom of opinion. In the Assembly the President has been unusually liberal in interpreting the rules regarding discussions. Sir Mahomed Habibulla had on more than one occasion definitely ruled that the actions of the Dewan are beyond the purview of this House. But the present President has never sought protection under that ruling and in fact on several occasions intentionally allowed the members to abuse the advantage of the fact that the Dewan, the President and Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar are one and the same person. The curtailment of the freedom of speech is sought to be illustrated by the prohibitory orders. Prohibitory orders are not a new phenomena. I remember occasions when as a result of a general prohibitory order even the Royal birthday could not be celebrated in Shertalay. I am not trying to find precedents. Nor do I think that this is a step that precedents can justify. Each order has to be judged on its merits. What is the real situation now ? We have had a few specimens of State Congress speeches even in the Assembly. It was really fortunate that those speeches were delivered in the Assembly protected by Statute and the Police. If they were delivered outside the Hall, especially in such inflamable places as Nedunganda and Chengannur, the consequence would have been disastrous. Moreover, whatever might have been the causes, the unhappy incidents at several public meetings had given rise to a lot of illfeelings and it was inevitable that a truce was

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

announced and time given to the people to calm down and regain their balance. If only the State Congress had also the good sense to view it in that light and allowed some quiet and rest everything would have been calm within a few weeks and the prohibitory order could have been withdrawn.

Much has been said about the gagging of the newspapers. When I say that I have at all times advocated and even now I do advocate the repeal of the Newspaper regulation, I need not wait to explain my attitude in this affair. But I have no hesitation in saying that every filthy newspaper publishing filthy articles should not only be suppressed but its proprietors and publishers should be given exemplary punishments. However reluctant I may be I have to admit that several of our newspapers have degenerated into the lowest depth. A reference to any of the recent issues of Probodhini or Navasakthi will convince anyone of the truth of my statement. Sir, referring to Navasakthi dated June 24th, I would invite the attention of the House to the editorial under the heading "Sani Desa". The word Sani Desa carries a very bad meaning to the people of this country. It may be translated to English as 'cursed age'. A more objectionable, a more misleading or a more dangerous title is impossible to find out and adopt. Now I would come to a few passages in the editorial. After describing the disturbances at the State Congress meeting it says "മനുഷ്യബുദ്ധിക്ക് സ്വാഭാവികമായി ഉണ്ടാകുന്ന അനുമാനം ഇതിന്റെ പിന്നിൽ ഏതോ ഒരു ഗൂഢശക്തി പ്രവർത്തിക്കുന്നുണ്ടെന്നാണ്" Again it says "തിരുവനന്തപുരത്ത് ഒരു അജ്ഞാതശക്തിയുടെ ഗൂഢപ്രവർത്തനഫലമായി മി. മാധവരീയർ, ആ നിമസ്ക്രീൻ, പരമേശ്വരൻപിള്ള, കെ. പി. നീലകണ്ഠപ്പിള്ള എന്ന നാലു കാൺഗ്രസ്സുകാർ ഈ ഗൂഢശക്തിയുടെ മർദ്ദനത്തിനിരയായി കഴിഞ്ഞു." What is this 'see its power' and what is the 'unknown power' influencing this 'secret power'? The Editorial adds "സർ. സി. പി. അഖിലേതരപ്രശസ്തിയുള്ള ഒരു രാജ്യതന്ത്രജ്ഞനാണ്. ഏതാണ്ട് ഷഷ്ടിപൂർത്തിയോട് അടുക്കാറായിരിക്കുന്ന ഈ രാജ്യതന്ത്രജ്ഞൻ തന്റെ ജീവിതസായാഹ്നം ജനങ്ങളുടെ ഇടയിൽ ഒഴിഞ്ഞുവാണുകൊണ്ടും ആശങ്കകൾക്കും ഇടവരുത്തിയിരിക്കുന്നു." I leave it there without any comment of my own. The editorial concludes thus: "തിരുവിതാംകൂറിന്റെ ഈ ശനി ദശ എന്നവസാനിക്കുമെന്ന് ചോദിച്ചാൽ ചെയ്യുന്ന ശ്രീപത്മനാഭനല്ലാതെ ഉണർന്നിരിക്കുന്നവരിചാക്കും പറയുവാൻ കഴിയുമെന്നു തോന്നുന്നില്ല". Only the sleeping Sree Padmanabha and no one who is awake can say when this cursed period of Travancore is to end.

Sir, it may not be proper on my part to explain the implications of the various expressions used there. I do not mean to explain these allusions, rather dangerous allusions, but the self-evident implications of the last one sentence alone would convince the members of this House of the audacity of the editor of that paper. I would refer again to the issue of another paper named "Probodhini" dated 22nd June 1938, to the article named "Seventeenth June 1938". This is a paper which has made no secret that Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar and his Government are the only foes of the State Congress in Travancore. After having repeatedly given expression to this sentiment two sentences are cunningly introduced

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. Kainikara M. Padmanabha Pillai.]

"രാജധാനിയും പ്രധാന ന്യായാസനവും സകല ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥരുടേയും അദ്ധ്യക്ഷപീഠങ്ങളും സ്ഥിതിചെയ്യുന്ന തലസ്ഥാനനഗരിയിൽ അന്വേഷണംകൊണ്ട് അപരാധികളെ കണ്ടുപിടിക്കുവാൻ കഴിയാത്തവണ്ണം അക്രമികളെ ഗോപനം ചെയ്യുന്ന ഒരു തിരസ്കരണിയുണ്ടെന്ന് വരുന്നതു് ഈ രാജ്യത്തിന് അത്യന്തം അശ്രേയസ്കരമായ ഒരവസ്ഥയാകുന്നു", കോൺഗ്രസ്സ് പ്രവർത്തകന്മാരേ ഇരുട്ടടി അടിച്ചും ഭയപ്പെടുത്തിയും ഈ പ്രസ്ഥാനത്തെ അമർത്തുവാൻ ഏതോ ഒരു ഗൂഢശക്തി ശ്രമം ചോക്കിനികളായ ഈ അടിക്കാരുടെ പിന്നിലുണ്ടെന്ന് സാമാന്യബുദ്ധിയുള്ളവരാരും നിഷേധിക്കുമെന്നു തോന്നുന്നില്ല."

Again, Sir, I refuse to explain its implications.

PRESIDENT: You have got two minutes more.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: Sir, I want to refer to only one more sentence and that is as follows: "രാജ്യമിങ്ങു തന്നിട്ടു പൊയ്ക്കൊള്ളണമെന്ന് ഇവിടത്തെ കോയ്മയോടു് നാമാരും ആവശ്യപ്പെടുന്നില്ല".

Sir, I cannot conceive a more outrageous piece of audacity in a journal. (*Shame*). The paper says that no one has asked His Highness the Maharaja to hand over the administration of the State and quit the country. I am not pleading against any paper. I am not suggesting that any action ought to have been taken or ought to be taken against any paper. All that I want to impress upon the House is that in spite of the fact that a section of our press has become nauseatingly rotten, they are enjoying an unprecedented degree of liberty.

I do not propose to take up much more time of the House. But before I resume my seat, I must make one more observation. I am one with Mr Pattom Thanu Pillai in one point. It is high time that Government knew their own minds. It is no use calling the State Congress disloyal and subversive. And then there is our Chief Secretary who has been making inconsistent and self-contradictory statements. It is no fun to call a man "disloyal" and I can fully understand and appreciate the indignation of Mr. Pattom Thanu Pillai. The other day he was calling the Government "cowardly". In his position I too would have called Government "cowardly" a hundred times. It may be that the Government are not really cowardly but generous. It might be that they are in possession of satisfactory evidence and are refraining from taking action due to leniency. But nobody need give the credit for it and the State Congress is not the organisation to show the least political courtesy. The other day in the course of a public meeting one of their leaders said that the Government had at first decided to prohibit the meeting and it was only when they heard that the order will be disobeyed that they refrained from issuing the order. Therefore if Government are convinced that the State Congress is disloyal and subversive they must take action against the organisation. If not they must avoid insulting expressions.

PRESIDENT: The honourable member will resume his seat.

MR. C. O. MADHAVAN: Sir, I oppose the motion. The motion before the House as it is worded is to discuss the way in which civil liberties are curtailed by Government.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

PRESIDENT : Order, order. The debate automatically closes at 12.50 and it is now 12.42. You have got only eight minutes more.

MR. C. O. MADHAVAN : It is hardly possible for me to deal with the various points raised in such a short time.

PRESIDENT : You can't help.

MR. C. O. MADHAVAN : Mr. Pattom Thanu Pillai and other speakers have explained the meaning of the resolution. The actions of the Government towards the curtailment of civil liberties according to them fall in two categories. One is the prohibition of public meetings and the other the suppression of newspapers. Sir, I would first take up the question of newspapers. I do not want to repeat what some of the honourable members on the other side have said. From the extracts read from some of the newspapers, it can be clearly seen how tolerant the Government have been to refrain from taking action against newspapers publishing such violent and highly objectionable articles. And yet some of the members would try to make it appear that there is no freedom of the press in Travancore.

Mr. E. P. Varghese read a few passages from a newspaper which led to the suppression of that newspaper. I ask the honourable members of this House whether it is possible for any Government not to take the action which this Government took in respect of that paper.

MR. E. JOHN PHILIPOSE : Will the honourable member be pleased to state whether he is aware that the particular statement in that paper was reprinted from another magazine published in Travancore?

MR. C. O. MADHAVAN : That has not been brought to the attention of Government as far as I am aware.

Coming to the prohibition of public meetings, Mr. Thanu Pillai began by saying that even the first meeting of that organisation was prohibited by the District Magistrate. As the whole country knows, the State Congress is only the successor of prior political organisations formed with the object of.....

MR. E. JOHN PHILIPPOSE : Sir, is the Chief Secretary in order in making this insinuation?

PRESIDENT : No insinuation is made. The Chief Secretary will continue.

MR. C. O. MADHAVAN : Sir, it was not an insinuation. I only say with what object the State Congress was formed. So far as public meetings are concerned, the duty of the Government is clear. When a meeting is held it is the duty of the Government to see that no breach of peace occurs. Opinions differ regarding the activities of the State Congress. That being the case, the Government had very good reasons to take action for preventing a breach of peace in connection with these meetings. It was the clear duty of the District Magistrate to see that no breach of peace occurred. So the District Magistrate issued orders to prohibit such meetings.

In another direction also the Government have got a clear duty to perform. If any public activities of such organisations are likely to tend to create ill-feeling and enmity between the various classes of people, it is the duty of the Government to prevent the same.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. E. JOHN PHILIPPOSE: May I know the class of people to which the Chief Secretary refers in this connection?

MR. C. O. MADHAVAN: By class, I do not mean any particular community. As Mr. T. M. Verghese pointed out, I know that the State Congress is composed of various communities. I only meant people holding different opinions.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI: Is it the Government's opinion that difference of opinion is not allowed in the State?

MR. C. O. MADHAVAN: No, Sir, differences of opinion are allowed, but they should not lead to violent conflicts and breaches of peace.

It is in the discharge of the elementary duty of the District Magistrate that he issued such prohibitory orders.

In both the matters the Government took the action which was absolutely necessary to meet the situation. There is absolutely no meaning in saying, that in Travancore people are not permitted to enjoy civil liberties. They are in full enjoyment of all kinds of civil liberties. To ask for more would be not to ask for civil liberty, but license and the Government cannot allow that.

***MR. A. THANU PILLAI:** *Sir, I must begin by submitting, that the position, the whole situation has been brought up by, what may be called a gross misunderstanding by Government of the entire situation. The Chief Secretary stated that the State Congress is a successor of prior political organisations. So far as I can say, it is the successor of a political organisation that was once formed, six or seven years ago, and the first conference of which was presided by Sir M. Viswaswaraiah. That organisation was started for the purpose of agitating for the establishment of responsible Government in this State. But I strongly oppose the statement that this organisation is a successor of the Samyuktha Party. If by the State Congress the Chief Secretary meant that it is a successor of the former Samyuktha Party, then I strongly repudiate that misunderstanding. The State Congress is not by any means a product or a successor of the Samyuktha Party. As one of the oldest members of this Legislature it is my duty at this juncture.....

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI: May I know what connection there is between the Samyuktha party and the State Congress party?

MR. A. THANU PILLAI: Sir, the object of the Samyuktha party was the same. But then, the work would not proceed because of the clash between the communities in the country.

The fundamental mistake made by Government is that they have viewed, on grounds proper or improper, that there is something between the State Congress and the Samyuktha party. Simply because some of those members holding responsible positions in the community happened to be members of the State Congress, Government made the fundamental mistake of thinking that there is something between the State...

* Speech not corrected by the member.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. M. SIVATHANU PILLAI: Sir, one question.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI: I don't yield. Then, what was the reason for issuing prohibitory orders even before a single meeting was held.

PRESIDENT: Order, order. It is now time.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI: Sir, one minute more. It is not right to pick just one passage here and one passage there and attack the party on any cause. The Chief Secretary says that the District Magistrate issued orders to prevent breach of peace. One member states that it was as a result of the meeting that the present orders were issued. I must say that it is the Government who are to blame in this. The Police were responsible for the breach of peace, if any. There was no occasion for breach of peace. The Police set up rowdies and showed an occasion for the breach of peace. Mr. Padmanabha Pillai spoke as if he knows the mind of Government. He said that if the conditions were allowed and the feeling.....

MR. KAINIKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI: I did not say that.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI: These difficulties were brought out by the Government and there is absolutely no blame on the members of the State Congress. I challenge the Government and the National party here.....

PRESIDENT: The time is up.

Now the question before the House is

"to reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,55,925 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1"

The question was put to vote and declared lost.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI: Sir, I demand a Poll.

Accordingly a poll was taken and the House divided as follows.

AYES 20.

1	Mr.	Kannara Gopala Panickar	11	Mr.	K. R. Narayanan
2	,,	C. Jebamony Nadar	12	,,	S. Nilakanta Pillai
3	,,	A. J. John	13	,,	E. John Philipose
4	,,	P. K. Kumaran	14	,,	P. J. Sebastian
5	,,	Sahib Bhahadur P. K. Kunju	15	,,	A. Thanu Pillai
			16	,,	K. T. Thomas
6	,,	P. Kunjukrishnan	17	,,	T. M. Varughese
7	,,	M. G. Mathew	18	,,	V. K. Velayudhan
8	,,	P. Nanoo	19	,,	K. Kesavan
9	,,	N. Narayana Kurup	20	,,	G. P. Neelakanta Pillai
10	,,	K. Narayanaperumal Nadar			

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

NOES 42.

1	Mr.	Kottalil P. Abraham	22	Mr.	S. Narayana Pillai
2	,,	P. C. Adichan	23	,,	R. Narayanan Namboori
3	,,	Sahib Bahadur V. Chandamiah	24	Srimati	T. Narayani Amma
4	,,	S. Chattanatha Karayalar	25	Mr.	Kainikara M. Padmanabha Pillai
5	,,	M. L. D'Cruz	26	,,	N. Ramakrishna Pillai
6	,,	E. E. Pandarathil	27	,,	Codiveetil C. Ramankunju
7	,,	D. Francis	28	,,	M. Ramiah Pillai
8	,,	M. L. Janardana Pillai	29	,,	P. Sivarama Pillai
9	,,	N. John Joseph	30	,,	M. Sivathanu Pillai
10	,,	N. V. Joseph	31	Dr.	C. R. Harler
11	,,	Joseph Vithayathil	32	Mr.	G. B. E. Truscott
12	,,	K. C. Karunakaran	33	,,	E. P. Varughese
13	,,	T. T. Kesavan Sastri	34	,,	Puliyoor T. P. Velayudhan Pillai
15	,,	K. P. Kochukora Tharkan	35	,,	N. Velu Achary
16	,,	Kaviyoor K. K. Kochukunju	36	,,	A. Gopala Menon
16	,,	S. Krishna Aiyar	37	,,	P. Narayana Pillai
17	,,	Puthupalli S. Krishna Pillai	38	,,	M. Govinda Pillai
18	,,	C. Kumara Das	39	,,	K. J. Cheriyan
19	,,	Thariathu Kunjithommen	40	Dr.	G. D. Nokes
20	,,	C. O. Madhavan	41	Mr.	M. Ramachandra Rao
21	,,	P. V. Mathai Chemparathy	42	,,	K. R. Narayana Iyer

NEUTRALS 2.

1	Sahib Bahadur	M. K. Mackar Pillai	2	Mr.	P. Vivekanandam

The motion was declared lost 20 voting for, 42 voting against and 2 remaining neutral.

Motions Nos. 366—420.

The following motions were not moved as the time allotted for them expired:—

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI :

366. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,58,435 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. K. KESAVAN :

367. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,200 for Director of Information by Rs. 1,200.

MR. K. T. THOMAS :

368. To omit the allotment of Rs. 4,200 for Director of Information.

MR. P. NANOO :

369. To omit the allotment of Rs. 4,200 for Director of Information.

MR. T. M. VARUGHESE :

370. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,200 for Director of Information by Re. 5.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. P. NANOO:
371. To omit the allotment of Rs. 324 for quarterly local allowance for tuning pianos and repairing clocks.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI:
372. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,524 for salaries by Rs. 1,524.

DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION—*Contingencies.*

MR. A. J. JOHN:
373. To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,000 for purchase of Cameras, etc.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI:
374. To omit the allotment of Rs. 16,026 for Department of Information.

MR. A. J. JOHN:
375. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 16,026 for Department of Information by Rs. 14,167.

MR. S. NILAKANTA PILLAI:
376. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. S. NILAKANTA PILLAI:
377. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI:
378. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. S. NARAYANA PILLAI:
379. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. K. KESAVAN:
380. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. K. KESAVAN:
381. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re 1.

MR. K. KESAVAN:
382. To reduce the allotment of Rs 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. K. KESAVAN:
383. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. K. KESAVAN:
384. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. K. KESAVAN:
385. To reduce the allotment of Rs 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. K. KESAVAN;
386. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. K. KESAVAN:
387. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. P. K. KUNJU :
388. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Rs. 5.

MR. P. K. KUNJU :
389. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Rs. 5.

MR. P. K. KUNJU :
390. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Rs. 5.

MR. KANNARA GOPALA PANICKAR :
391. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. KANNARA GOPALA PANICKAR :
392. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. KANNARA GOPALA PANICKAR :
393. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. KANNARA GOPALA PANICKAR :
394. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. KANNARA GOPALA PANICKAR :
395. To reduce the allotment of Rs 2,71,591 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re 1.

MR. KANNARA GOPALA PANICKAR :
396. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. KANNARA GOPALA PANICKAR :
397. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. KANNARA GOPALA PANICKAR :
398 To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI :
399. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI :
400. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. JOHN JOSEPH :
401. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI :
402. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,953 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. K. P. KOCHUKORATHARAKAN :
403. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. T. M. VARUGHESE :
404. To reduce the allotment of Rs 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Rs. 5.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. K. R. NARAYANAN :
405. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. KOTTALIL P. ABRAHAM :
406. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI :
407. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. M. L. JANARDANA PILLAI :
408. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. N. JOHN JOSEPH :
409. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. THARIATHU KUNJITHOMMEN :
410. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 271,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. T. M. VARUGHESE ;
411. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,71,951 for General and Revenue Secretariat by Rs. 5.

MR. K. KESAVAN :
412. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 100 for travelling allowance by Re. 1.

MR. K. NARAYANAPERUMAL NADAR :
413 To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,000 for expenditure on books, periodicals etc., by Re. 1.

MR. N. L. JANARDANA PILLAI :
414. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 2,87,111 under Demand XI by Re. 1.

MR. N. VELOO ACHARY ;
415. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 2,87,111 under Demand XI by Re. 1.

MR. S. NILAKANTA PILLAI :
416. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 2,87,111 under Demand XI by Rs. 5.

MR. S. NILAKANTA PILLAI :
417. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 2,87,111 under Demand XI by Rs. 5.

MR. S. NILAKANTA PILLAI :
418. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 2,87,111 under Demand XI by Rs. 5.

MR. P. C. ADICHAN ;
419. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 2,87,111 under Demand XI by Re. 1.

MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN :
420. To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 2,87,111 under Demand XI by Re. 1.

PRESIDENT : The question before the House now is that the Government be granted a sum of Rs. 2,87,111 under—Demand XI—General Administration—Excluding Financial Secretariat, Account Office, Legislative Bodies and Public Service Commissioner.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

The motion was put to vote and carried.

The Demand was passed and the grant was made.

DEMAND XII—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—FINANCIAL SECRETARIAT AND ACCOUNT OFFICE.

MR. K. J CHERIYAN: Sir, I rise to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 2,14,892 under Demand XII—General Administration Financial Secretariat and Account Office.

Motions Nos. 421 to 426.

The following motions were not moved.

MR. KANNARA GOPALA PANICKAR:

421. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 13,039 for establishment by Re. 1.

MR. KANNARA GOPALA PANICKAR:

422. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,500 for travelling allowance by Re. 1.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI:

423. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 24,315 for Financial Secretariat by Re. 1.

MR. N. JOHN JOSEPH:

424. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,07,377 for Account Office by Re. 1.

MR. T. T. KESAVAN SASTRI:

425. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,07,377 for Account Office by Re. 1.

MR. KAVIYOOR K. K. KOCHUKUNJU:

426. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,07,377 for Account Office by Re. 1.

PRESIDENT: The question before the House is that the Government be given a grant of Rs. 2,14,892 under Demand XII—General Administration—Financial Secretariat and Account Office.

The motion was put to vote and carried.

The grant was made.

DEMAND XIII—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—LEGISLATIVE BODIES.

MR, C. O. MADHAVAN: Sir, I move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 52,500 under Demand XIII—General Administration—Legislative Bodies.

The following motions were not moved.

Motion No. 427.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI:

"To reduce the allotment of Rs. 42,000 for travelling allowance by Re. 1."

Motion No. 428.

MR. K. KESAVAN;

"To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,000 for remuneration for election commissioners etc., by Re. 1.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly